arXiv:1604.08705v1 [math.LO] 29 Apr 2016

Turing Schmerl Logic for Graded Turing Progressions

Eduardo Hermo Reyes *
Joost J. Joosten †
University of Barcelona

May 2, 2016

Abstract

Turing progressions arise by iteratedly adding consistency statements to a base theory. Different notions of consistency give rise to different Turing progressions. In this paper we present a logic that generates valid principles that hold between the different Turing progressions. The logic is proven to be sound and some relations between this logic and **RC** are shown. This is a draft version and shortly a more complete version will be published.

1 Introduction

After Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems [10], we know that any consistent arithmetical theory, sufficiently rich, is incomplete. Moreover, by the Second Incompleteness Theorem, we know that such a theory cannot prove its own consistency.

In other words, given a consistent arithmetical theory T containing, say elementary arithmetic EA, we have that $T \nvdash \mathrm{Con}(T)$ and therefore, extending T by the consistency assertion $\mathrm{Con}(T)$, we get a stronger theory. If we started with a sound theory T, the new system $T + \mathrm{Con}(T)$ is affected once more by Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems so it cannot prove its own consistency. Hence we can extend it by adding the corresponding consistency assertion obtaining a new stronger, but again incomplete system.

In 1936 Turing started working on his PhD dissertation under the direction of Alonzo Church. The results of this work were published in 1939 under the title *Systems of logic based on ordinals* [15]. Here, Turing introduced what are now known as Turing progressions which are hierarchies of theories that arise by iterating this process of adding consistency statements to a base theory, even to transfinite levels. Turing progressions are widely used in proof theory and

*ehermo.reyes@gmail.com
†jjoosten@ub.edu

can serve the purpose of gauging the proof-theoretic strength of mathematical theories that contain arithmetic.

It is known that the standard propositional provability logic **GL** containing a modality $\Box$ to model the standard formalized provability predicate can be used to denote any finite Turing progression. The logic **GLP** was introduced by Japaridze in [12] and contained a range of modalities $[n]$, one for each $n < \omega$, that can be interpreted as a sequence of ever increasing provability predicates.

In [4] it is shown that transfinite Turing progressions up to the ordinal ε_0 can be approximated using the polymodal provability logic **GLP**. In particular, [4] showed how an ordinal analysis of Peano Arithmetic can be performed mainly within **GLP**.

On the one hand, **GLP** has many good algebraic properties and is very expressible in that it constitutes for an alternative ordinal notation system. On the other hand, the link from **GLP** to Turing progressions is only by approximating the progression so that applications of **GLP** require many technical results. In this paper a first investigation is undertaken to see if there are logics which are still expressible and have good algebraic properties but which can be used to directly denote Turing progressions rather than just approximating them. In this sense, our logic is inspired by what is called Reflection Calculus **RC** ([7], [6], [8]). Like with **RC**, we shall focus on strictly positive formulas which are formulas that do not contain disjunction nor implication.

The arrangement of the paper is the following: Section 2 introduces some basic arithemtical definitions such as n-consistency or Δ_0- *presented theories*. In this Section we shall also discuss the notion of *Smooth Turing progressions* and how they are presented within arithmetic.

In Section 3 we introduce a propositional modal language using *ordinal modalities*, which are ordered pairs $\langle n, \alpha \rangle$ where $\alpha \in \varepsilon_0$ and $n \in \omega$. We will also establish a way to interpret our modal formulae in (possibly infinitely axiomatized) theories that contain a sufficient amount of arithmetic. This way, the intended reading of $\langle n, \alpha \rangle \varphi$ will be the n-consistency α times iterated over the arithmetical interpretation of φ.

In Section 4 we will introduce the system **TC** (for Turing Calculus). The derivable objects of this system are *sequents*, i.e., expressions of the form $\varphi \vdash \psi$ whose intended interpretation is to express the entailment between the theories denoted by the modal formulas φ and ψ.

In Section 5, we will see how to fix the interpretation for these sequents within EA^+ and we prove the Soundness of **TC** with respect to this interpretation. Finally, in Section 6 we will explore the relations between the closed fragment of **RC** and the finite fragment of **TC**.

2 Turing Progressions

We will focus on theories that contain a Π^0_1 formulation of EA^+. By doing so, the logical complexity of our theories can be low yet various arguments requiring cut-

elimination can be formalized. Here, EA^+ is Robinson's arithmetic Q together with induction for bounded formulas. Note that EA^+ in our formulation has a function symbol for the super-exponential function $x \mapsto 2_x^x$ defined by $2_0^x := x$ and $2_{y+1}^x := 2^{2_y^x}$. To be more precise, we will consider Δ_0- *presented theories*[1], that are, theories whose set of Gödel numbers can be defined on the natural numbers by a bounded formula. Note that since supexp is in our language, our notion of Δ_0- presentable does not coincide with the more standard one from the literature where one considers theories whose set of axioms are definable via an elementary formula. Again, via Craig's trick, we think that this difference is not too important.

2.1 Arithmetical preliminaries

As usual, by $\Box_T(x)$ we denote $\exists y \, \mathrm{Prf}_T(y, x)$; an arithmetical Σ_1-formula expressing that there is y such that y codes a proof in T of a formula with code x. By $\overline{n}$ we denote the *numeral* $S(S(\ldots S(0)\ldots))$ (n times). We will use just n when it cannot be mislead with a variable. Often, we write $\Box_T(\varphi(\dot{x}))$ instead of $\Box_T(\ulcorner \varphi(\dot{x}) \urcorner)$, where $\ulcorner \varphi(\dot{x_1}, \ldots, \dot{x_j}) \urcorner$ denotes the map sending $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ to the Gödel number $\ulcorner \varphi(\overline{n_1}, \ldots, \overline{n_j}) \urcorner$.

Definition 2.1 (n-consistency)**.** *A theory U is called n-consistent if U together with the set of all true Π_n-sentences is consistent.*

The n-consistency of the theory U can equivalently be expressed (see e.g. [5]) by the arithmetical formula:

$$\mathrm{Con}_n(U) := \quad \forall x \in \Pi_{n+1} \; (\Box_U(x) \to \mathsf{Tr_{n+1}(x)}) \tag{1}$$

where $x \in \Pi_{n+1}$ expresses that x is the Gödel number of a Π_{n+1} sentence, and $\mathsf{Tr_{n+1}}$ is the standard Π_{n+1}-truth definition for Π_{n+1}-formulas. Notice that the arithmetical complexity of $\mathrm{Con}_n(U)$ is Π_{n+1}.

Definition 2.2 (Presented theories)**.** *A theory U is Δ_0-presented iff there is a bounded arithmetical formula $\sigma(x)$ that defines the sets of Gödel numbers coding the axioms of U in the standard model of arithmetic. By $\epsilon(x)$ we denote the canonical numeration of EA^+.*

Definition 2.3 (Elementary linear ordering)**.** *A pair $(D, \prec)$ is an elementary linear ordering iff both D and $\prec$ are elementary defined, $D \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, $\prec \subseteq D^2$ and EA^+ proves that $\prec$ linearly orders D. An elementary linear ordering is a well-order if it is well-founded in the standard model.*

2.2 Smooth Turing Progressions

Turing progressions are hierarchies of theories such that given an initial theory T, we can construct a transfinite sequence of extensions of T by iteratedly adding

[1] By Craig's trick it is known that every recursively enumerable theory has an equivalent elementary presentation so this is not really a restriction.

n-consistency statements. These progressions can be defined according to the following conditions below. Let us assume that we have fixed some recursive limit ordinal Λ together with a natural ordinal notation system for Λ that is elementary represented.

T1. $T_n^0 := T$ where T is an initial or base theory;

T2. $T_n^{\alpha+1} := T_n^\alpha \cup \{\mathrm{Con}_n(T_n^\alpha)\}$;

T3. $T_n^\lambda := \bigcup_{\beta<\lambda} T_n^\beta$, for λ a limit ordinal below Λ.

Here we will consider *Smooth Turing progressions*, studied by Beklemishev in among others [5] and [1]. We give a slightly different presentation.

Suppose we are given some elementary well-ordering $(D, \prec)$ and an initial theory T. The conditions T1-T3 can be reformulated by the unique following clause:

$$T_n^\alpha := T \cup \{\mathrm{Con}_n(T_n^\beta) : \prec(\beta, \alpha),\ \beta \in D\} \quad \forall \alpha \in D,\ n < \omega$$

So, given such a family of theories $(T_n^\alpha)_{n<\omega}^{\alpha\in D}$ we have that they can be represented within EA^+ through some arithmetical formula numerating their axioms. This way, consider the elementary formula $\tau_n^{\sigma(z)}(x, y)$ where x is a variable for an ordinal $\alpha \in D$, y stands for the coding of some arithmetical formula and $\sigma(z)$ is an elementary formula enumerating the axioms of some base theory. Hence, roughly speaking, the formula tells us that the formula coded by y is an axiom of T_α^n where the initial theory is numerated by the elementary formula $\sigma(z)$. We shall often refrain from distinguishing an ordinal and its code, and likewise for other objects that are coded, like formulas and proofs.

We say that $\tau_n^{\sigma(z)}(\alpha, x)$ enumerates the α-th theory of a progression based on iteration of consistency along $(D, \prec)$ with base $\sigma(z)$ if:

$$EA^+ \vdash \tau_n^{\sigma(z)}(\alpha, x) \leftrightarrow ((\epsilon(x) \vee \sigma(x)) \vee \exists\beta\,(\prec(\beta, \alpha)\ \wedge x = \ulcorner \mathrm{Con}_n(\tau_n^{\sigma(z)}(\dot{\beta}, y)\urcorner))$$

The existence of such $\tau_n^{\sigma(z)}(\alpha, x)$ is guaranteed by the fixed point theorem.

3 Strictly Positive Signature

As we have pointed out, we shall work with a positive propositional modal signature consisting of one constant symbol $\top$, one logical connective $\wedge$ and a set of modal connectives $\mathcal{M} := \{\langle n, \alpha\rangle : n < \omega \text{ and } \alpha < \varepsilon_0\}$, named *ordinal modalities* The set of formulas in this language is defined as follows:

Definition 3.1. *By* $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ *we denote the smallest set such that:*

i) $\top \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$;

ii) If $\varphi, \psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}} \Rightarrow (\varphi \wedge \psi) \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$;

iii) if $\varphi \in \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$, $n < \omega$ *and* $\alpha < \varepsilon_0 \Rightarrow \langle n, \alpha\rangle\varphi \in \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$.

Within $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ we can find some special formulas, named *Ordinal Worms* -OWs-, that are defined as follows:

Definition 3.2 (Ordinal Worms, $\mathbb{W}^{On}$)**.** *The set of OWs denoted by* $\mathbb{W}^{On}$ *is inductively defined as:*

i) $\top \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$*;*

ii) if $n < \omega \ \wedge \ \alpha < \varepsilon_0 \ \wedge \ B \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$ *then* $\langle n, \alpha\rangle B \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$.

Also, for any $n < \omega$ we define $\mathbb{F}^{succ}_{<n} \subset \mathbb{F}_{<n} \subset \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ as follows:

Definition 3.3.

1. $\mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$ *is the smallest set such that:*

   i) $\top \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$*;*

   ii) if $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$ *and* $\psi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$ *then* $\varphi \wedge \psi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$*;*

   iii) if $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$ *and* $m < n$*, then* $\langle m, \beta + 1\rangle\varphi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$.

2. $\mathbb{F}_{<n}$ *is the smallest set such that:*

   i) $\top \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$*;*

   ii) if $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$ *and* $\psi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$ *then* $\varphi \wedge \psi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$*;*

   iii) if $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$ *and* $m < n$*, then* $\langle m, \beta\rangle\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n}$.

From now on, we let Greek letters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \ldots$ denote ordinals below ε_0, Greek lower case in the middle of the alphabet like φ, ψ, χ denote formulas, and capital latin letters $A, B, C, \ldots$ denote OWs. Also, given $A \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$ of the form $\langle n_0, \alpha_0\rangle \ldots \langle n_k, \alpha_k\rangle\top$, and $\varphi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ by $A\varphi$ we denote the formula ψ obtained by the concatenation $\langle n_0, \alpha_0\rangle \ldots \langle n_k, \alpha_k\rangle\varphi$.

3.1 Arithmetical Interpretation for Modal Formulas

Let us introduce now the arithmetical interpretation of our modal formulae in terms of the τ-formulae previously presented. Notice that the conjunction of modal formulas is intended to mean the union of theories. Hence, we map the interpretation of modal conjunctions to the disjunction of the respective interpretations.

Definition 3.4. *An arithmetical interpretation for* $\mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ *is a map* $* : \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}} \longrightarrow \mathit{Form}_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{N}}}$ *inductively defined as follows:*

1. $(\top)^*(x) = \epsilon(x)$*;*
2. $(\varphi \wedge \psi)^*(x) = (\varphi)^*(x) \vee (\psi)^*(x)$
3. $(\langle n, \alpha\rangle\varphi)^*(x) = \tau_n^{\varphi^*(y)}(\alpha, x)$.

Note that since $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ has no propositional variables, we can identify a modal formula with its arithmetical interpretation unambiguously.

Definition 3.5. *Given a numeration σ, by Th_σ we denote the theory of σ. We say that $\chi \in \mathsf{Th}_\sigma$ iff $\mathbb{N} \models \sigma(\ulcorner \chi \urcorner)$.*

For the sake of clarity, and since we are working in the close fragment, we will use the following notation: given $\varphi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ by Th_φ we denote Th_σ where $\varphi^*(x) = \sigma(x)$, following Definition 3.4. If $\varphi^*(x) = \epsilon(x)$ we use just EA^+ instead of Th_ϵ. Also if $\varphi := \langle n, \alpha\rangle\psi$ we write $(\mathsf{Th}_\psi)^\alpha_n$ for the theory of $(\langle n, \alpha\rangle\psi)^*$.

4 Turing Calculus

In the previous Section we have defined an arithmetical interpretation that allows us to denote Turing progressions by modal formulas in $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$. In this section we introduce the logic **TC** in this modal language whose main goal is to express valid relations that hold between Turing progressions. It is worth mentioning the special character of Axioms 5 and 8 since both axioms are modal formulations of principles related to Schmerl's Fine Structure Theorem, also known as *Schmerl's formula* (see [14] and [3]).

In order to simplify notation, here we shall also introduce the so-called *hyper-exponential* functions $e^n : \mathrm{On} \to \mathrm{On}$, as studied in [9], where On denotes the class of ordinals, e^0 is the identity function, $e^1 : \alpha \mapsto -1 + \omega^\alpha$ and $e^{n+m} = e^n \circ e^m$. Together with the hyper-exponential functions, we also introduce the IT-function, $i : (\mathbb{N} \times Ord)^k \to Ord$, defined as follows:

i) $i((n, \gamma)) = e^n(\gamma)$;

ii) $i((n_0, \gamma_0), \ldots, (n_{j+1}, \gamma_{j+1})) = e^{n_{j+1}}(\ i((n_0, \gamma_0), \ldots, (n_j, \gamma_j))\ ) \cdot (1 + \gamma_{j+1})$.

Since $e^0(\gamma) = \gamma$ we write γ as an argument of the IT-function to denote the pair $(0, \gamma)$.

Definition 4.1. ***TC** is given by the following set of axioms and rules:*

Axioms:

1. $\varphi \vdash \varphi, \quad \varphi \vdash \top$;
2. $\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \varphi, \quad \varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \psi$;
3. $\langle n, \alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle n, \beta\rangle\varphi, \quad$ *for* $\beta \leq \alpha$;
4. $\langle n, \alpha + \beta\rangle\varphi \equiv \langle n, \beta\rangle\langle n, \alpha\rangle\varphi$;
5. $\langle m + n, \alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m, e^n(\alpha)\rangle\varphi$;
6. $\langle n, \alpha\rangle\varphi \wedge \psi \vdash \langle n, \alpha\rangle(\varphi \wedge \psi) \quad$ *for* $\psi \in \mathbb{F}^{suc}_{<n}$;

7. $\langle m+n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m+n,\alpha\rangle\langle m,\beta\rangle\varphi \quad$ *for* $\beta < e^n(\alpha)$ *and* $n > 0$;

8. $\langle n_0,\alpha_0\rangle \ldots \langle n_m,\alpha_m\rangle\varphi \equiv \langle n_1,\alpha_1\rangle \ldots \langle n_m,\alpha_m\rangle\varphi \wedge$
$\langle n_0, i(\alpha_m,(n_m - n_{m-1},\alpha_{m-1}),\ldots,(n_1-n_0,\alpha_0))\rangle\varphi$
for $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n_0+2}$ *and* $n_k < n_{k+1}, 0 \leq k < m$.

Rules:

1. $\varphi \vdash \psi$ *and* $\phi \vdash \chi$, *then* $\varphi \vdash \psi \wedge \chi$;

2. $\varphi \vdash \psi$ *and* $\psi \vdash \chi$ *then* $\varphi \vdash \chi$;

3. *If* $\varphi \vdash \psi$, *then* $\langle n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle n,\alpha\rangle\psi$;

4. *If* $\langle n_0,\alpha_0\rangle \ldots \langle n_m,\alpha_m\rangle\varphi \vdash \psi$ *then*
$\langle n_0, i(\alpha_m,(n_m - n_{m-1},\alpha_{m-1}),\ldots,(n_1-n_0,\alpha_0))\rangle\varphi \vdash \psi$
for $\psi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n_0+1}$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n_0+2}$ *and* $n_k < n_{k+1}, 0 \leq k < m$..

By convention we take that for any n, $\langle n,0\rangle\varphi$ is just φ. Also, instead of saying that $A \vdash B$ is provable in **TC**, we shall often just write $A \vdash B$. Let us, by way of exercise, prove a monotonicity property of **TC**.

Lemma 4.2 (Monotonicity)**.** *For any* $\varphi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ *and* $\alpha < \epsilon_0$*:*

$$\langle n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m,\alpha\rangle\varphi \quad \text{for } m < n.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on $n - m$. Base case follows from Axioms 5 and 3. For the inductive case, we check it for $n - m' = k + 1$. Assume as I.H. that for $n - m = k$, $\langle n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m,\alpha\rangle\varphi$. Hence, by I.H., $\langle n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m,\alpha\rangle\varphi$, and by base case $\langle m,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m',\alpha\rangle\varphi$.

□

Some other useful properties that we shall use without further mention are expressed in the next Proposition.

Proposition 4.3. *For any* $A \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$ *and* $\varphi,\psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$:

1. *If* $\varphi \vdash \psi$, *then* $A\varphi \vdash A\psi$;

2. $A\varphi \vdash \varphi$;

3. $A\varphi \vdash A$;

4. $\langle m+n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \vdash \langle m,\alpha\rangle\varphi$;

5. $\langle m+n,\alpha\rangle\varphi \equiv \langle m+n,\alpha\rangle\langle m,\beta\rangle\varphi \quad$ *for* $\beta < e^n(\alpha)$ *and* $n > 0$.

5 FTP-Interpretation

In this section we shall prove that the logic **TC** adequately describes graded Turing progressions. First we shall make the link between our logic and graded Turing progressions more precise by introducing the *Formalized Turing Progression (FTP) Interpretation*.

5.1 FTP-interpretation

The Formalized Turing Progression Interpretation (FTP), is the representation of the entailment between the corresponding first order theories within EA^+, via the Π_2-sentence expressing such derivability. Thus given $\varphi, \psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ the intended interpretation of $\varphi \vdash \psi$ is the arithmetical statement:

$$\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x \, (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x) \,).$$

Before proving Soundness we would like to introduce some useful tools that will be used along our proof.

Lemma 5.1. *Provably in EA^+:*

1. $\forall x \, (\Box_U(x) \to \Box_T(x) \,) \to (\, Con_n(T) \to Con_n(U) \,)$;
2. $U \equiv_n T \to (\, Con_n(T) \leftrightarrow Con_n(U) \,)$;
3. $\forall \alpha \succ 0 \; \forall x \, (\, \Box_{T^\alpha_n}(x) \to \exists \gamma \prec \alpha \; \Box_T \, (Con_n(T^{\dot\gamma}_n) \dot\to x) \,)$;

Proof. We just check item 3. Reasoning informally, let π such that $\Box_{T^\alpha_n} \pi$. Hence, we can consider a finite $\Sigma \subseteq \mathsf{Axioms}(T^\alpha_n)$ such that every axiom in Σ is of the form $\mathrm{Con}_n(T^\gamma_n)$ for $\gamma \prec \alpha$ and $\Box_{T+\Sigma} \pi$. Moreover, we can pick out of Σ the axiom with the largest ordinal, so Σ can be replaced by just this axiom. Then, we just have to apply Formalized Deduction Theorem. □

Lemma 5.2 (Schmerl)**.** *Given T, a Π_{m+2}-axiomatized extension of EA, then provably in EA^+:*

S1 $\forall \alpha \succ 0 \; T^\alpha_{m+n} \equiv_m T^{i((n,\alpha))}_m$;

S2 $\forall \beta \succ 0 \; (T^\beta_{m+n})^\alpha_m \equiv_m T^{i(\beta,(n,\alpha))}_m$.

From now on, we will also employ another trick coming from the work of Schmerl [14] and used by Beklemishev in [2] and [3] under the name of *reflexive induction*.

Proposition 5.3 (Reflexive induction)**.** *For any p.r. well-ordering $(D, \prec)$, any theory T containing EA^+ is closed under the following reflexive induction rule:*

$$T \vdash \forall \alpha \, (\Box_T(\forall \beta < \dot\alpha \; \varphi(\beta)) \to \varphi(\alpha)) \Longrightarrow T \vdash \forall \alpha \, \varphi(\alpha)$$

Proposition 5.4. *For any extension T of EA, provably in EA^+:*

1. $Con_{m+n}(T) \wedge \pi \to Con_{m+n}(T + \pi)$
2. $(T + \pi)^{\alpha}_{m+n} \equiv (T)^{\alpha}_{m+n} + \pi$

for $\pi \in \Pi_m$ *and* $\alpha \prec \varepsilon_0$.

Proof. Item 1 can be easily checked. For Item 2 we proceed by reflexive transfinite induction on α. Reasoning in EA^+, assume Item 2 for all $\beta \prec \alpha$ as I.H. For left-to-right implication, consider χ such that $\Box_{(T+\pi)^{\alpha}_{m+n}}\chi$. Hence,

$$\begin{array}{ll} \Box_{(T+\pi)^{\beta}_{m+n}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{m+n}((T+\pi)^{\gamma}_{m+n}) \to \chi\,) & \text{for some } \gamma \prec \alpha; \\ \Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{m+n}((T+\pi)^{\gamma}_{m+n}) \to \chi\,) & \text{by I.H. and monotonicity.} \end{array}$$

Since $\Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}\mathrm{Con}_{m+n}((T)^{\gamma}_{m+n})$ and $\Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}\pi$, hence, applying Item 1 we get that $\Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}\mathrm{Con}_{m+n}((T)^{\gamma}_{m+n} + \pi)$, and so:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}\mathrm{Con}_{m+n}((T+\pi)^{\gamma}_{m+n}) & \text{by I.H. and Lemma 5.1, Item 1;} \\ \Box_{(T)^{\alpha}_{m+n}+\pi}\pi. & \end{array}$$

Right-to-left implication follows straightforwardly. □

5.2 Soundness

Theorem 5.5 (Soundness)**.** *Given* $\varphi, \psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$*, if* $\varphi \vdash \psi$ *then*

$$EA^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x)\,).$$

Proof. By induction on the length of a **TC** proof of $\varphi \vdash \psi$. It is easy to see that the first rule preserves validity. Recall that the arithmetical interpretation of a conjunction is the union of the arithmetical interpretation of the conjuncts.

The first three axioms are easily seen to be arithmetically valid. In particular, Axiom 3 expresses the *provably monotone* property for Smooth Turing progressions. For a proof of Soundness of Axiom 4 see Lemma 2.6 in [2]. Validity of Axiom 6 follows from Proposition 5.4 Item 2. The remaining axioms and rules are separately proven to be sound in the next subsection. □

Lemma 5.6. *Rule 2 is sound w.r.t. FTPI.*

Proof. We need to check that $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x)\,)$ whenever $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x)\,)$ and $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x)\,)$. By a generalization of Parikh's theorem (See **??**, Chapter V, Theorem 1.4), if $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x \exists y\ \varphi(x, y, z)$ for some $\varphi(x, y, z) \in \Delta_0$, then we know that we can find an elementary bound on y. That is, we find some natural number n so that $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x \exists y{<}2^{x+z}_n\ \varphi(x, y, z)$. Hence if $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x)\,)$ and $\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\ (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x)\,)$, then there are terms t_0 and t_1 such that:

$\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\, \forall p\, \exists p' < t_0(x,p)\ (\mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}(p,x) \to \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(p',x))$ and
$\mathrm{EA}^+ \vdash \forall x\, \forall q\, \exists q' < t_1(x,q)\ (\mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(q,x) \to \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(q',x))$, respectively.

Consider ϕ such that $\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}\phi$ i.e. $\exists r\ \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\chi}(r, \ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$. Therefore, we get that $\exists r' < t_0(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner, r)\ \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(r, \ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$ and then, $\exists r'' < t_1(\ulcorner\phi\urcorner, r')\ \mathsf{Proof}_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(r'', \ulcorner\phi\urcorner)$. Hence, $\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}\phi$.

□

Lemma 5.7. *Axiom 5 is sound w.r.t. FTPI.*

Proof. We check that provably in EA^+:

$$\forall \alpha \succ 0\ \forall x\ (\ \Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{e}^{\mathsf{n}}(\alpha)}_{\mathsf{m}}}(x) \to \Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(x)\ ).$$

Reasoning in EA^+: first, notice that by $S1$ we have that all axioms of $(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{e}^{\mathsf{n}}(\alpha)}_{\mathsf{m}}$ are provable in $(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}$. Consider χ such that $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{e}^{\mathsf{n}}(\alpha)}_{\mathsf{m}}}\chi$. Hence we have that there is $\gamma \prec e^n(\alpha)$ such that $\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(\ \mathrm{Con}_m((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}}) \to \chi\ )$. Thus, by monotonicity, $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(\mathrm{Con}_m((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}}) \to \chi\ )$ and again, by $S1$, $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\mathrm{Con}_m((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}})$. Therefore $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\chi$. □

Lemma 5.8. *Axiom 7 is sound w.r.t. FTPI*

Proof. We must show that, provably in EA^+:

$$\forall x\ (\ \Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(x) \to \Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(x)\ )$$

for $\beta \prec e^n(\alpha)$. Let χ such that $\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\chi$ and reason in EA^+ as follows:

$\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}}}(\ \mathrm{Con}_{n+m}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}) \to \chi\ )$	for $\gamma \prec \alpha$;
$\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(\ \mathrm{Con}_{n+m}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}) \to \chi\ )$	by monotonicity and Aixiom 5, since $\beta \prec e^n(\alpha)$;

Note that $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}(\ \mathrm{Con}_{n+m}((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}) \wedge \mathrm{Con}_{\mathsf{m}}((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})\ )$, therefore:

$\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\mathrm{Con}_{n+m}((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}} + \mathrm{Con}_{\mathsf{m}}((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}}))$;	
$\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\mathrm{Con}_{n+m}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\beta}_{\mathsf{m}})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}})$	by Proposition 5.4 and Lemma 5.1, Item 1

Thus, $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha}_{\mathsf{m}+\mathsf{n}}}\chi$. □

Proposition 5.9. *Given $\varphi \in \mathbb{F}_{<n_0+2}$ and $n_i < n_{i+1}$ for $0 \le i \le j$, provably in EA^+:*

$$(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_j}_{\mathsf{n}_j}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0} \equiv_{\mathsf{n}_0} (\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_j,(\mathsf{n}_j-\mathsf{n}_{j-1},\alpha_{j-1}),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_1-\mathsf{n}_0,\alpha_0))}_{\mathsf{n}_0}$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on j. Base Case is trivial. Also, notice that for $j = 1$, the Proposition is Schmerl's Fine Structure Theorem. For the Inductive Step, assume the Lemma for j as I.H. and consider $\chi \in \Pi_{n_0+1}$ such that $\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_1}_{\mathsf{n}_1}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0}) \to \chi\,) && \text{for } \gamma \prec \alpha_0;\\
&\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0}) \to \chi\,) && \text{by I.H. ;}\\
&\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0}) \to \chi\,) && \text{by monotonicity.}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1} \equiv_{\mathsf{n}_1} (\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_1}_{\mathsf{n}_1}$, we can easily check that $((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\beta}_{\mathsf{n}_0} \equiv_{\mathsf{n}_0} ((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_1}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\beta}_{\mathsf{n}_0}$ for any β and $n_0 < n_1$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0});\\
&\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0})\\
&\qquad\qquad\text{by Lemma 5.1 Item 2;}\\
&\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi;\\
&\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi.
\end{aligned}$$

For the other direction, assume $\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_1-\mathsf{n}_0,\alpha_0))}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi$, for $\chi \in \Pi_{n_0+1}$, and reason as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Box_{((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi;\\
&\Box_{(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0}) \to \chi\,)\\
&\qquad\qquad\text{for } \gamma \prec \alpha;\\
&\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}(\,\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0}) \to \chi\,)\\
&\qquad\qquad\text{by I.H. and monotonicity.}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}((\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0})$, therefore we can conclude that $\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\mathrm{Con}_{n_0}(((\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\mathsf{i}(\alpha_{j+1},(\mathsf{n}_{j+1}-\mathsf{n}_j,\alpha_j),\ldots,(\mathsf{n}_2-\mathsf{n}_1,\alpha_1))}_{\mathsf{n}_1})^{\gamma}_{\mathsf{n}_0})$ what finally yields $\Box_{(\ldots(\mathsf{Th}_\varphi)^{\alpha_{j+1}}_{\mathsf{n}_{j+1}}\ldots)^{\alpha_0}_{\mathsf{n}_0}}\chi$. □

Corollary 5.10. *Axiom 8 is sound w.r.t. FTPI.*

Corollary 5.11. *Rule 4 is sound w.r.t. FTPI.*

6 Comparing Reflection Calculus and Turing Progressions Calculus

In this Section, we will discuss some relations between the *finite formulas* of **TC** and the closed fragment of **RC**. Here, by finite formulas we mean the formulas in $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_{\varepsilon_0}}$ such that every element in the ordinal modality is less than ω. The set of these formulas, denoted by $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$, is inductively defined as follows:

1. $\top \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$;
2. If $\varphi, \psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$, then $\varphi \wedge \psi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$;
3. If $\varphi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$, then $\langle m, n\rangle\varphi \in \mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ for $m, n < \omega$.

As expected, OWs in $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ behave better that OWs using transfinite ordinals. Some of these properties are listed below:

Proposition 6.1. *For all $A \in \mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ there is $B \in \mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ satisfying the following:*

1. *$A \equiv B$;*
2. *B is of the form $\langle n_0, m_0\rangle \dots \langle n_j, m_j\rangle\top$ where $n_i < n_{i+1}$ for $0 \leq i < j$.*

Proof. This can be checked by induction on the length of A. Base case is trivial. For the inductive step, combine I.H. together with Proposition 4.3, Item 5. □

Definition 6.2. *Let $A := \langle n_0, m_0\rangle \dots \langle n_j, m_j\rangle\top$ and $B := \langle l_0, v_0\rangle \dots \langle l_i, v_i\rangle\top$ be OW in $\mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$, we say A is the tail of B if:*

1. *$j < i$ and;*
2. *for all k, $0 \leq k \leq j$, $n_k = l_{k+(i-j)}$ and $m_k = v_{k+(i-j)}$.*

Proposition 6.3. *Given $A, B \in \mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$:*

1. *$A \vdash B$ or $B \vdash A$;*
2. *$\exists C \in \mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ such that $C \equiv A \wedge B$.*

Proof. We check Item 1. Item 2 follows straightforwardly from 1. Let $A' := \langle n_0, m_0\rangle \dots \langle n_j, m_j\rangle\top$ and $B' := \langle l_0, v_0\rangle \dots \langle l_i, v_i\rangle\top$ be the normal forms of A and B generated by previous Proposition. If A' is the tail of B' (B' is the tail of A') clearly $B \vdash A$ ($A \vdash B$). If this is not the case, let $D = \{j : j \leq \min(\mathit{length}(A'), \mathit{length}(B'))$ and $(n_j \neq l_j \vee m_j \neq v_j)\}$ and let $d = \max D$ i.e. the bigest index where a difference in the ordinal modalities occurs. If $n_d < l_d$ ($l_d < n_d$) then $B \vdash A$ ($A \vdash B$). If $n_d = l_d$ then either $m_d < v_d$ or $v_d < m_d$ and so, $B \vdash A$ or $A \vdash B$ respectively.

□

Notice that previous Proposition does not hold in general for $A, B \in \mathbb{W}^{On}$. For example, consider $\langle 0, \omega+1\rangle\top$ and $\langle 1,1\rangle\top$. Neither $\langle 0,\omega+1\rangle\top \vdash \langle 1,1\rangle\top$ nor $\langle 1,1\rangle\top \vdash \langle 0,\omega+1\rangle\top$ holds.

Corollary 6.4. *For all $\varphi \in \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ there is $B \in \mathbb{W}^{On} \cap \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ satisfying the following:*

1. *$\varphi \equiv B$;*
2. *B is of the form $\langle n_0, m_0\rangle \ldots \langle n_j, m_j\rangle\top$ where $n_i < n_{i+1}$ for $0 \leq i < j$.*

6.1 A RC-Translation

Let us denote by $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathbf{RC}}$ the closed fragment of **RC** formulas and consider the following translation g from $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$ to $\mathtt{Form}^0_{\mathbf{RC}}$:

1. $(\top)^g = \top$;
2. $(\varphi \wedge \psi)^g = (\varphi)^g \wedge (\psi)^g$;
3. $(\langle m, 1\rangle\varphi)^g = (\varphi)^g \wedge \langle m\rangle(\varphi)^g$.

In [7], Beklemishev showed the arithmetical completeness of **RC** with respect to a natural arithmetical interpretation where modal formulas are translated into arithmetical formulas defining the set of Gödel numbers that code the Axioms of arithmetical theories extending PA. More precisely, $\top$ is translated into the formula numerating the Axioms of PA, ε_{PA}, the conjunction is translated into the disjunction of the translations and $\langle n\rangle\varphi$ is translated into the arithmetical formula $\underline{\mathrm{Con}_n((\varphi)^*)}$ that defines the set of Gödel numbers of PA together with the Gödel number of the formula $\mathrm{Con}_n((\varphi)^*)$ where $(\varphi)^*$ is the arithmetical interpretation of φ. The completeness theorem states the following, given $\varphi, \psi \in \mathtt{Form}_{\mathbf{RC}}$:

$$\varphi \vdash \psi \quad \text{iff} \quad \mathsf{PA} \vdash \forall x\,(\Box_{\psi^*}(x) \to \Box_{\varphi^*}(x)).$$

There are obvious similarities between **RC** and **TC**. Both signatures and arithmetical interpretations almost coincide. In fact, let *' be the arithmetical interpretation for **TC** taking PA as base theory and * the arithmetical interpretation of **RC**:

Lemma 6.5. *For every $\varphi \in \mathit{Form}^s_{\mathbf{TC}}$;*

$$(\varphi)^{*'} = ((\varphi)^g)^*$$

Proof. By induction on the complexity of φ with base and conjuctive cases being trivial. For $\varphi := \langle n, 1\rangle\psi$ assume the Lemma for ψ and reason as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(\langle n,1\rangle\psi)^{*'} &= (\psi)^{*'}(x) \vee \sigma_{PA}(x) \vee x = \ulcorner \mathrm{Con}_n(Th_{\psi^{*'}})\urcorner;\\ &= ((\psi)^g)^*(x) \vee \sigma_{PA}(x) \vee x = \ulcorner \mathrm{Con}_n(Th_{((\psi)^g)^*})\urcorner;\\ &= (\psi \wedge \langle n\rangle\psi)^*;\\ &= ((\langle n,1\rangle\psi)^g)^*.\end{aligned}$$

□

This allows to conclude a first preservation result between **TC** and **RC**:

Proposition 6.6. *Given* $\varphi, \psi \in \mathit{Form}^0_{\mathcal{L}_\omega}$*;*

$$\textit{if } \varphi \vdash_{\boldsymbol{TC}} \psi \textit{ then } (\varphi)^g \vdash_{\boldsymbol{RC}} (\psi)^g.$$

Proof. If $\varphi \vdash_{\mathbf{TC}} \psi$ then by **TC** artihmetical soundness:

$$\mathsf{PA} \vdash \forall x\, (\Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\psi}(x) \to \Box_{\mathsf{Th}_\varphi}(x)).$$

This combine together with previous Lemma and **RC** arithmetical completeness yields $(\varphi)^g \vdash_{\mathbf{RC}} (\psi)^g$. □

Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank Lev Beklemishev and Andrés Cordón Franco for their technical suggestions during the writting of this work.

References

[1] L. D. Beklemishev. Provability logics for natural Turing progressions of arithmetical theories. *Studia Logica*, 50(1):109–128, 1991.

[2] L. D. Beklemishev. Iterated local reflection vs iterated consistency. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 75:25–48, 1995.

[3] L. D. Beklemishev. Proof-theoretic analysis by iterated reflection. *Archive for Mathematical Logic*, 42(6):515–552, 2003.

[4] L. D. Beklemishev. Provability algebras and proof-theoretic ordinals, I. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 128:103–124, 2004.

[5] L. D. Beklemishev. Reflection principles and provability algebras in formal arithmetic. *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk*, 60(2):3–78, 2005. In Russian. English translation in: Russian Mathematical Surveys, 60(2): 197–268, 2005.

[6] L. D. Beklemishev. Calibrating provability logic. In T. Bolander, T. Braüner, T. S. Ghilardi, and L. Moss, editors, *Advances in Modal Logic*, volume 9, pages 89–94, London, 2012. College Publications.

[7] L. D. Beklemishev. Positive provability logic for uniform reflection principles. *ArXiv:1304.4396 [math.LO]*, 2013.

[8] E. V. Dashkov. On the positive fragment of the polymodal provability logic GLP. *Mathematical Notes*, 91(3-4):318–333, 2012.

[9] D. Fernández-Duque and J. J. Joosten. Hyperations, Veblen progressions and transfinite iteration of ordinal functions. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 164(7-8):785–801, 2013.

[10] K. Gödel. Über formal unentscheidbare sätze der principia mathematica und verwandter systeme I. *Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik*, 38:173–198, 1931.

[11] P. Hájek and P. Pudlák. *Metamathematics of First Order Arithmetic*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1993.

[12] G. Japaridze. The polymodal provability logic. In *Intensional logics and logical structure of theories: material from the Fourth Soviet-Finnish Symposium on Logic*. Metsniereba, Telaviv, 1988. In Russian.

[13] J. J. Joosten. Turing-Taylor expansions for arithmetic theories. *ArXiv:1404.4483v1 [math.LO]*, 2014.

[14] U. R. Schmerl. A fine structure generated by reflection formulas over primitive recursive arithmetic. In *Logic Colloquium '78 (Mons, 1978)*, volume 97 of *Stud. Logic Foundations Math.*, pages 335–350. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979.

[15] A. Turing. Systems of logics based on ordinals. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 45:161–228, 1939.